

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 112 were presented by Applicants and rejected. Claims 1 is amended. No new matter is being added.

In a prior Office Action (dated February 27, 2006), the Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama in view of Chino. Subsequently, in Amendment B, Applicants amended claim 1 and provided Remarks illustrating how claim 1 is patentable over Sugiyama and Chino. In the most recent Office Action (August 4, 2006), the Examiner introduces the Steele reference, finding claims 1, 15-16, 35, 47, 50, 65, 78, 92-93 and 112 unpatentable over the combination of Steele and Sigiyama.

Claim 1 as amended recites:

A printer for printing time-based media, the printer comprising:
a communication interface for receiving time-based media data from a media source;
a processor for performing a multimedia function on the time-based media data to automatically identify a portion of the time-based media data corresponding to criteria received from a user;
a user interface, communicatively coupled to the processor, including:
 a display, for providing data to the user;
 an input device, for receiving the criteria from the user;
a first output device for receiving the identified portion of the time-based media data from the processor and automatically outputting the identified portion on a printer; and
a second output device coupled to the processor for receiving the identified portion of the time-based media and producing an electronic output including the identified portion of the time-based media.

Steele does not disclose the claimed invention. Steele discloses a system for video browsing on the World Wide Web, and is directed at solving the “problem of providing video data in a manner which best utilizes the available throughput to provide video data in a form which is most useful to the user” (col. 2, lines 62-65). A user is provided with thumbnails of a video image. By selecting a pair of the

thumbnails, a new set of thumbnails is generated, each of the new thumbnails taken from a portion of the video temporally between the chosen pair. This allows the user to narrow the time frame of thumbnails being looked at, in order to locate a particular portion of the video. (See, e.g., col. 3, line 57 to col. 4, line 21.)

Steele does not disclose the claimed element of “a first output device for receiving the identified portion of the time-based media data from the processor and automatically outputting the identified portion on a printer”. The portion of Steele cited by the Examiner at col. 8, lines 14-23 discloses only that thumbnail objects are displayed on a screen for a user to view. There is no disclosure or suggestion of portions of time-based media identified as corresponding to provided criteria being automatically output to a printer.

Sugiyama does not provide this missing feature. Sugiyama discloses a video printer that allows frames of a video to be deleted and replaced with “white mute data”. At the portion cited by the Examiner (col. 4, lines 45-47 and 52-54), the reference discloses only that an image displayed on a monitor can be printed by manual selection of a “memory key” button.

Thus, even the combination of Steele with Sugiyama does not teach, disclose or suggest “a first output device for receiving the identified portion of the time-based media data from the processor and automatically outputting the identified portion on a printer”, as claimed. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over Steele and Sugiyama and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Independent claim 78 is patentable over the combination of Steele and Sugiyama for reasons analogous to claim 1. Dependent claims 2-77 and 79-112 are also patentable over the cited references, because each depends from patentable claim 1 or claim 78, respectively, and in addition recites its own patentable features.

If any matters remain outstanding prior to allowance of the claims, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at (415) 875-2358 or via e-mail

at dbrownstone@fenwick.com. Applicants acknowledge that a copy of any electronic mail communications will be made of record in the application file per MPEP § 502.03.

Respectfully submitted,
Peter E. Hart *et al*

Date: January 4, 2007

By: Daniel R. Brownstone 46,581/
Daniel R. Brownstone, Reg. No. 46,581
FENWICK & WEST LLP
Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Tel: (415) 875-2358/Fax: (415) 281-1350
dbrownstone@fenwick.com